

(Translation)

Notification of Reason(s) for Refusal

Patent Application No. 2001-550983

Drafting Date: July 29, 2009

Examiner of JPO: SHIRAISHI Tsuyoshi

Attorney: SHIGENOBU Kazuo

Applied Provision: JP Patent Law § 29(2) § 36(6)(ii)

This application should be not allowed for the reasons mentioned below. If the applicant has any argument against the reasons, such argument should be submitted within 3 months from mailing date (The due date of this case is November 4, 2009).

REASON No.1 **JP Patent Law § 29(2)**

The invention(s) in the claim(s) mentioned below of the subject application should not be granted a patent under Patent Law Section 29(2) since it could have easily been made by persons who have common knowledge in the technical field to which the invention(s) pertains, on the basis of the invention(s) described in the publication(s) mentioned below which was distributed in Japan or foreign countries prior to the filing of the subject application.

The list of cited documents

Japanese Patent publication No.H11-250383: as the cited document No.1

Japanese Patent publication No.H11-283158: as the cited document No.2

Japanese Patent publication No.H08-287386: as the cited document No.3

Japanese Patent publication No.H10-243438: as the cited document No.4

Claims 1-10

The cited documents No.1-4 disclose the invention of claims 1-10 substantially. (Especially paragraphs 0002-0025 in the cited document No.1, paragraphs 0036-0065 in the cited document No.2 paragraphs 0020-0021 in the cited document No.3)

In addition, paragraph 0020 in the cited document No.3 discloses “satellite communication module”, paragraphs 0004, 0018 in the cited document No.1 disclose “GPS”, “emergency sensor”, and “the phone mode is interrupted”.

Further, the invention of claim 8 is well known art.

REASON No.2 **JP Patent Law § 36(6)(ii)**

This application does not comply with the requirements under JP Patent Law § 36(6)(ii).

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10

The terms “a private subscription”, “a service subscription” in claims 1, 3, 7, 10 are not definite.

OUR PROFESSIONAL OPINION

Regarding reason 1, after having reviewed the cited documents No.1-4 in details, we think the cited documents No.1-4 disclose the invention of claims 1-10 substantially. Please let us have your instruction.